



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/614,635	· · · ·	07/12/2000	Ulrich Sigmund	RAV10009	2264	
22862	7590	11/26/2003		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
GLENN I			WOOD, WI	WOOD, WILLIAM H		
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,	•		2124	7	
				DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003	/	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		PLC				
	Application N .	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/614,635	SIGMUND, ULRICH				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William H. Wood	2124				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension						
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments do not overcome the prior art rejection. Applicant asserts Ansari does not disclose the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 12. These have been mapped out in paper 3 mailed 3 April 2003. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language reads upon Ansari. Ansari generates an abstract representation and translates for processing. Applicant further asserts Ansari's claim is more limiting than Applicant's invention (page 7, line 11-21; Applicant's remarks received 10 November 2003). This does not alter the fundamental position that Applicant's claimed invention reads upon the disclosure of Ansari. Applicant's broader claim is not a qualification for Applicant to limit Ansari et al. from their rightfully claimed invention. These issues are believed to address Applicant's concerns and as such the indepenent claims along with all other claims are rejected..

TODD INGBERG / PRIMARY EXAMINER